

### REMARKS

The foregoing amendments adopt completely the Examiner's proposed claims with the exception of the phrase "the spherical object" in line 8 of claim 136 (in the Examiner's proposed claim in paragraph 8 of the Office Action) and the phrase "the spherical object" in line 8 of claim 148 (in the Examiner's proposed claim in paragraph 10 of the Office Action). It is believed that the Examiner meant to say (in the case of claim 136): "an adhesive material between the base of said first void and said first semiconductor" rather than "an adhesive material between **the spherical object** a base of said first void and said first semiconductor" (emphasis added).

After these amendments, all claims conform to the Examiner's proposed claims except as noted (i.e. the phrase "the spherical object"), and hence all claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for taking the time to prepare the proposed claims.

The obviousness-type double patenting rejection has been overcome with the submission of two terminal disclaimers, and this submission is made without agreeing that the rejection is proper.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fees which may be due in connection with this submission.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: Dec. 1, 2008



James C. Scheller, Jr.

Reg. No. 31,195

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040  
(408) 720-8300